



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

un

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,447	11/20/2003	David M. Salcedo	C4-1114US (23336-18)	9828

7590 05/30/2007
Dean D. Small
The Small Patent Law Group LLP
Suite 1611
611 Olive Street
St. Louis, MO 63101

EXAMINER

LAI, ANNE VIET NGA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/30/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/718,447

Applicant(s)

SALCEDO ET AL.

Examiner

Anne V. Lai

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 89-123 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 89-123 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 102 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 6, "an objection recognition system" should be changed to - - an object recognition system - -. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 90-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matters which were not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claim 90, the limitation "video segment is recorded entirely before being retrieved by said PDA" is not previously described in the specification.

In claim 91, the limitation "pre-recorded video segment" is not previously described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2612

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 89, 92-116 and 118-123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Monroe1** ([US 2004/0117638], previously provided) or **DeLean** [US 2003/0190076] in view of **Monroe2** ([US 6,518,881] previously provided).

In claim 89, Monroe1 discloses a security system comprising:

a camera (40, figs. 3-4);

an object recognition system (facial recognition analyzer 46, facial database 47) coupled to the camera to providing an identification signal based on a detected object and initiating recording of a video still frame image of the detected object (stored on image server 45; par. 44-47, 143, 149); and

a PDA 43 (fig. 4) wirelessly coupled to the object recognition system and the camera to receive the identification signal and in response thereto retrieve the recorded video signal for display (allowing the facial database to be consulted by devices on a different network, par. 35, 40; wireless monitor station 43, par. 148-149, 200-205).

DeLean teaches a security system as claimed (fig. 1, camera 102, vision processing system 104, data storage 108, and other devices 110; the other devices include: alarm system, recording system, PDA, metal detector, article screening device, etc.; par. 43-59, fig. 6). DeLean teaches taking appropriated actions if image matching occurred; e.g. sending message to security authority.

Monroe1 and DeLean do not specific about input command to PDA to retrieve the recorded video signal, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art, a PDA is well known having communication ability to retrieve video signal when needed,

Art Unit: 2612

for example security verification purpose (see Monroe2, fig. 3, PDA with keyboard input and video recorder playback, col. 9, l. 55-58).

In claims 92-94, Monroe1 and DeLean disclose the object recognition system provides an identification signal to initiate recorder recording and PDA displaying alarm message.

In claim 95, Monroe1 discloses video segment corresponding to detected object is recorded if object image matches a stored object (par. 143).

In claim 96, Monroe2 teaches user input command to PDA for transmission.

In claims 97-98, Monroe1 discloses object recognition system provides indication to the PDA whether the detected object is an authorized or an unauthorized object (par. 79-82).

In claim 99, Monroe1 discloses the recorder wirelessly coupled to the PDA (fig. 4).

In claim 100, Monroe1 discloses the surveillance camera and object recognition system as claimed.

In claim 101, Monroe1 discloses a split screen monitor 41 (fig. 4); obviously the PDA could have the split screen as well. Monroe2 teaches a PDA having a multifunction video display displaying moving video, still images, textual information and graphic information in a multi-window format (col. 3, l. 31-33). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art, a split screen display can be used to display both live video and recorded video as user choice for security verification purpose.

In claim 102, Monroe1 discloses a security device comprising: a display screen and a data collection device in communication with an object recognition system (barcode number, fig. 11); and the security device can be portable (law enforcement, par. 200-205). Monroe2 teaches more in detail of the portable security device used by law enforcement comprising a user input device 180, a display screen 200, a data collection device (60, 66) to collect non-image security data, and a transceiver (figs. 2-3, col. 6, l. 41- col. 7, l. 2). I would have been obvious a portable security device provides advantage by its mobility.

In claims 103-107, Monroe2 device includes a video camera, a bar code scanner and a proximity card detector (magnetic stripe reader 66, fig. 2, col. 6, l. 41-67); and Monroe1 discloses transmitting to the security database information related to video, audio, and data from a detected object and sending alarm to display at the PDA 43 (figs. 4, 11; par. 167-170; correlation, par. 44). It would have been obvious all collected data would be correlated to ascertain a detected event is imminent and the person corresponding to the image is authorized or unauthorized.

In claims 108-109, Monroe1 discloses split screen monitor (41, fig. 4); and Monroe2 teaches a multifunction video display enabling simultaneous viewing video and non-video security data in a multi-window format (col. 3, l. 31-33).

In claim 110, Monroe combined discloses user input request for a recorded security video signal (Monroe1, par. 35, 40, 200-205; Monroe2, col. 9, l. 55-58).

In claims 111-112, Monroe1 discloses audio and visual alarm (par. 90-98).

In claim 113, Monroe combined discloses split screen monitor, multi-window format display for displaying image file and data related to the detected person (Monroe1, par. 167; fig. 4).

In claims 114, Monroe combined discloses a method for operating the security system of claims 89 as claimed.

In claim 115, Monroe1 discloses detecting entry of an object into the surveillance area and providing indication at the PDA 43 (fig. 4; par. 87-95).

In claim 116, Monroe1 discloses detecting entry of an object and recording live video to create recorded video segment (par. 36-37, 44).

In claim 118, Monroe combined disclose providing an image file representative of the object to the PDA (par. 45, 94).

In claim 119, Monroe1 discloses display simultaneously live video and recorded video segment (par. 37).

In claim 120, Monroe1 discloses the PDA responsive the identification signal to provide an alarm signal on the display screen (par. 87-95).

In claim 121, Monroe1 discloses user input request from the PDA (par. 94).

In claim 122, validation of acquired data with stored image would have been obvious.

In claim 123, Monroe2 teaches reading medical information on card by a card reader, capturing live video by a camera; and displaying both image and data of a person on the PDA (col. 6, l. 41- col. 7, l. 12).

Art Unit: 2612

5. Claim 117 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Monroe1** in view of **Swanson** (previously provided).

In claim 117, Monroe1 discloses recording only video streams upon detected motion within its field-of-view for reducing the storage requirement of the image archive platform (par. 36, 44). Monroe1 does not disclose discarding recorded video segment when object does not matched a stored object. . **Swanson** teaches surveillance system that stores only events identified as events of interest and deletes information that no longer wanted to make room in storage for subsequently captured information (abstract). In light of Swanson teaching, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art storing only the video segment of interest and discard the video segment that is not wanted for saving storage area.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 89-123 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion


7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Lawandy [US 2003/0161507]; Yeredor [US 2004/0240542]; Elazar [US 2004/0161133].
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne V. Lai whose telephone number is 571-272-2974. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am to 6:30 pm, Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hofsass Jeffery can be reached on 571-272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AVL

5/21/07


JEFFERY HOF SASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600